

NATIONAL REVIEW
BULLETIN

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600180002-1

AUG 2 1966

□ THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, after prolonged Senate debate, will remain under the watchful eye of Senator Richard Russell's CIA "watchdog" subcommittee. Senator Fulbright's resolution to create a new committee including three members of his own Foreign Relations Committee was brushed aside 61-28. In the open debate preceding an extraordinary closed session, Fulbright contended that the CIA "plays a major role in the foreign policy decision-making process." Snapped Russell: "I'm trying to keep him from muscling in on my committee." Besides, he added, Foreign Relations Committee members can get as much information from the director of the CIA as his subcommittee gets. All they have to do is ask.

CIA Truth Vs. Fiction

Critics of the United States Central Intelligence Agency would have us believe that the CIA is a cloak-and-dagger outfit operating virtually on its own, even making foreign policy.

This fiction enables CIA critics to arrive at the conclusion that the CIA must be curbed, that Senator J. W. Fulbright and his fellow doves must be given custody of the CIA "bully boys," and virtue thus returned to our foreign policy.

As a matter of fact, the real CIA bears no resemblance to the Fulbrightian version of the CIA. Its covert activities abroad are greatly overplayed, comprising only a minute fraction of its work which is, by and large, mostly routine compilation and research.

Adm. William F. Raborn, who preceded the new CIA Director Richard Helms, makes it clear in an interview in U. S. News & World Report that the CIA doesn't make foreign policy and always functions with the knowledge of the President, the State Department, the Defense Department and other policy-making agencies.

It also answers to appropriate committees in Congress as to its methods and operations. Its day-to-day operations are under the direct supervision of the National Security Council.

The CIA has five assigned functions: Advising the President and the National Security Council on intelligence matters relating to national security, coordinating all foreign intelligence activities of our government, producing and disseminating finished national intelligence within the government, and performing such other services as the National Security Council may direct.

Senator Fulbright in attempting to gain partial supervision of the CIA for his Foreign Relations Committee (fortunately rejected by an overwhelming Senate vote) indicated he wanted to probe its activities. We have not seen or heard information that would justify parading the inner workings of the CIA before the world.

As Raborn pointed out, when the enemy learns that our government has obtained certain information, it immediately goes after the source, which often is a CIA agent. Leaking of information could thus endanger the lives of CIA agents in hazardous overseas posts.

Instead of constantly knocking the CIA, the Senate doves should be glad they have such dedicated, courageous people serving in our first line of defense.

Censored Data On CIA Debate Is Released

A great deal about the Senate and its peculiar ways, its jealousies and even its gabbiness and precious little about the Central Intelligence Agency and its operations marked the Senate's July 14 closed session dealing with the country's top spy organization.

This was revealed with the release last night of the censored version of the debate that went on in the closed meeting that lasted for 3 hours and 40 minutes.

Except for one matter involving the Bay of Pigs debacle, most of the references to the CIA operations were deleted from the transcript which fill 21½ pages in today's Congressional Record.

In the transcript made public there were more than 20 instances of censorship which were referred to delicately as "omissions" or "deletions" or simply by asterisks.

Representation at Issue

At issue in the closed session, the first since 1963 and the second since early in World War II, was whether the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be given representation on the Senate group which maintains a sort of watchdog surveillance over the CIA.

The one reference to CIA operations involving the Bay of Pigs produced nothing essentially new. Sen. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, brought it up in arguing for a committee voice—or ear—in overseeing the intelligence agency because he said it involved foreign policy.

Fulbright contended that the CIA was involved in making policy or in operations affecting foreign policy and for this reason his committee was entitled to representation on the watchdog group.

Fulbright recalled a State Department meeting with the late President John F. Kennedy, Allen Dulles, the former director of the CIA, and, he said, about 15 others before the Bay of Pigs invasion.

He told the Senate he heard Dulles "make the case for intervention in the Bay of Pigs" and added:

"I heard this with my own ears, with Allen Dulles promoting it. I was there for two hours . . . Allen Dulles was making a case for it and urging the President to make a final decision. This matter had been under way for a year. He wanted a final decision that would be a green light to proceed. . . ."

Raises Point of Order

There the matter was dropped, with Fulbright declaring that the general proposition seems to be that "the CIA operates very broadly and very deeply in the field of foreign relations."

The debate, over-all, centered on jurisdictional matters with Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., a veteran of many parliamentary battles, opposing the committee's proposal to have three of its members on the overseeing committee.

Russell raised the point of order that the committee's resolution should be referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee, which he heads, as having original jurisdiction over CIA matters.

In the public session that followed the closed meeting Russell's views were sustained by a vote of 61 to 28.

Russell refused to promise anything, saying he would not act with a gun at his head.

One of the issues in the whole matter was whether there would be more likelihood of leaks if members were added to the committee that has not been known to disclose any secrets in its 17 years of existence.

Refers to Leaks

Senate Majority Whip Russell B. Long, D-La., supporting Russell's position, disclosed some instances of Senate gabbiness. He referred to a senator "who is no longer here" who leaked "some of our vital secrets" in 1952.

More recently, he said, there

was "something that happened at the White House" involving him and another senator that was supposed to be "a completely secret meeting." Long said it was published by Washington columnists.

Russell said that he had tried to work out a compromise but insisted that any selections from the Foreign Relations Committee should be based on seniority. Fulbright had refused, he said. "I think I have gone the last mile," Russell said.

JUL 26 1966

Bill to Curb Any New CIA Debate Filed

By the Associated Press

Sen. Leverett Saltonstall, R-Mass., moved today to prevent any recurrence of the Senate argument about which members are entitled to review the actions of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Saltonstall, a member of the current CIA watchdog committee, offered a bill he said would close a gap in Senate rules. It would provide that all original bills must be considered by "appropriate" committees before they can be brought up in the Senate.

In effect, the proposal would have the Senate Rules Committee set up the jurisdictional boundary lines for other committees.

The action grew out of the Senate's 61-28 decision, after an unusual closed session last month, to send to its Armed Services Committee a proposal to enlarge the present CIA watchdog group to include three Foreign Relations Committee members.

The proposal had been sent to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Saltonstall said in a statement it was bad practice for the Senate to have to decide whether one committee was encroaching on the territory of another.

CONGRESS:

Duel in the Dark

Most power struggles in the clubby world of the U.S. Senate are settled in the leathery sanctity of the cloakrooms—well out of public view. But last week two of the club's most influential elders duelled openly on the floor and not until the first blood was drawn did a solicitous Senate discreetly lower the curtain. For only the second time since World War II,* spectators were shoosd from the galleries and guards took up stations at the chamber's doors.

The issue was Senate supervision of the super-sensitive Central Intelligence Agency and the combatants were Georgia's powerful Richard Russell and Arkansas's senator J. William Fulbright. Since the CIA was founded in 1947, the overseer's job in the Senate has been handled by the "secret seven"—Russell and six members of the Armed Services and Appropriations committees. But, concerned about the CIA's role in U.S. policy, Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee has been pressing for a place on the board of review. Last week, the showdown finally came.

Rising at his mahogany desk, Fulbright demanded of Russell: "Why do you wish to monopolize [the CIA]?"

"I'm simply trying to keep you from muscling in on my committee," Russell replied tartly.

Thwarted: The rest of the joust was the Senate's secret, but the sum of Fulbright's argument was not. He had, he complained, been thwarted time and again when he tried to find out about the CIA's undercover operations—even concerning the U.S. scholarship program that carries Fulbright's name. He became enraged when ex-CIA chief William F. Raborn indicated he would be willing to talk—to the "secret seven."

With that, the Foreign Relations Committee voted to send to the Senate floor a proposal for the creation of a new CIA watchdog panel—with three members each from Armed Services, Appropriations and Foreign Relations.

That set the stage for the brief public battle of wills. In the exchange, Fulbright proclaimed "the basic constitutional responsibility" of his committee to



Associated Press

Russell: Don't muscle in

be wired in on CIA operations, while Russell heatedly warned that there might be "leaks" if the committee were expanded. That was all the Senate hierarchy wanted the public to hear. "We were afraid something would be said that would be regretted later on," said GOP leader Everett M. Dirksen, who joined the Democrats' Mike Mansfield in moving for a closed session.

When the doors swung open three hours and 40 minutes later, the Senate voted 61 to 28 to send the proposal to an early grave—in Russell's Armed Services Committee. Insiders speculated that Fulbright and Iowa's Bourke B. Hickenlooper might still be accepted as junior members of the "secret seven." But, for the moment, Fulbright could only observe dolorously and accurately: "I got beat."

*The other: an April 11, 1963, discussion of push hush missile matters.

JUL 16 1966

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600180002-1

Worm

Supervising the C.I.A.

In every respect it was a shoddy performance of the Senate majority in barring members of the Foreign Relations Committee from a panel that keeps watch over the Central Intelligence Agency.

Here was the Senate Establishment—the "Club"—at its stuffy worst, when one of its powerful elders, Mr. Russell of Georgia, put the controversy in terms of Senator Fulbright's "muscling in" on "my" committee. One might have expected the self-respect of the other members of the C.I.A. panel to assert itself against such petty possessiveness.

From what is known of that part of the debate held in secret, Mr. Russell and his supporters refused to come to grips with the problem that had inspired Senator Eugene McCarthy's proposal. Could any of the 61 who voted to keep the Foreign Relations Committee away from the C.I.A. argue seriously against Mr. Fulbright's point that the C.I.A. "plays a major role in the foreign policy decision-making process," and thus exerts "a substantial influence" on American foreign relations?

If that statement of the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is accepted, it follows logically that the Senate committee with responsibility for foreign relations should have a role in any intelligence supervision undertaken by the Congress. And it makes sense to establish a regular Senate committee with a professional staff for this surveillance or a joint committee, as in the case of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Senator Russell declined debate on this level, however. He preferred to brand the proposal "self-serving and self-seeking," and to hint that Foreign Relations members would be less discreet with state secrets than Senators from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees who make up the existing, informal C.I.A. panel.

The Georgia elder discredited not Senators Fulbright and McCarthy but himself. The sixty Senators who sustained his point of order and sent the McCarthy resolution to certain death in the Armed Services Committee tarnished only the "Club's" image.

This is not the end of the debate, however, for too many Americans remain uneasy about an agency that has appeared on too many occasions to be affecting the foreign policy of the United States without sufficient control or supervision.

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600180002-1

JUL 15 1966

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600180002-1

DAVID LAWRENCE

Raising CIA Issue a Wasted Effort

Although the Senate held a session in secret for several hours yesterday—something it rarely does—to debate a proposal to enlarge the committee which deals with the Central Intelligence Agency, the raising of the issue itself was a wasted effort.

For, even if the Senate hadn't voted, as it did, to shelve the measure, the President of the United States is empowered by constitutional precedents to decide to what committee of Congress, if any, he wishes to give information concerning the operations of any executive agency involving national security.

Two subcommittees—composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee—have been carrying on satisfactorily the relations between the Senate and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Senate, however, is divided today between those who consider themselves authorized not just to "advise" but to make American foreign policy and those who feel a sense of responsibility to the President as the person charged by the Constitution with the conduct of relations with the other governments in the world. It was evident from the start that the purpose of the move to enlarge the committee was primarily to get information to use in ways which could unwittingly do damage to American foreign relations. Again and again, news and radio dispatches in recent weeks from Peking and Moscow have reported how gratified the Communists were to be able to publicize the dissent expressed in the Senate as an indication that this nation is not behind its

government and will force a surrender in Viet Nam.

But even if there were no war going on, the restrictions on giving information concerning the Central Intelligence Agency are clear-cut. This was pointed out by Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, who has just retired as the head of the CIA. In an interview published this week in U.S. News & World Report, he said:

"The National Security Act makes the Director of Central Intelligence exclusively responsible for protecting the security of our sources and methods of the entire intelligence community. I was authorized by the President and by National Security Council directives to discuss such matters only with the special subcommittees designated for this purpose, not with any others.

"Q. What is the reason for this limitation?

"A. It is not arbitrary or bureaucratic—we are safeguarding the lives of trusted agents and our own staff people all over the world who contribute to our government's intelligence objectives.

"We owe it to them to take every precaution to protect them—and we owe it to our government to deny hostile intelligence services even indirect hints or the slightest clues which might enable them to take steps to blunt our intelligence operations, methods and sources.

"Q. Do you mean it is a question of security leaks?

"A. I prefer to say inadvertent disclosure. Even a professional intelligence officer has to be alert to draw the line between information which helps to evaluate or authenticate a piece of raw intelli-

gence, and information which might point to the source of the method we used to obtain it. The more people who have both types of information, the more you multiply the chance that somebody will overstep that line by accident.

"Q. How damaging can such disclosures be?

"A. Well, the minute you even hint that you have information the other fellow has been trying to keep secret, it is one of the first principles of the art that he will do everything possible to locate and destroy your source, or disrupt your method of operation. If the opposition is given any clues to help pinpoint the source, the counterintelligence job is that much easier."

The meetings between CIA officials and the existing congressional committees which deal with such matters have been satisfactory under both Republican and Democratic Congresses. Senators have respected the importance of protecting the sources and have recognized that to use in public speeches any information based on CIA data would only impair the usefulness of that organization.

The strangest thing about the whole episode is that, in the midst of a war crisis, some senators should insist upon any move which, by reason of indiscreet disclosures, could damage the United States abroad. Unfortunately questions like these are not clearly explained to the voters, or they would repudiate at the polls those members of Congress who put their own quest for publicity above the interests of their country.

© 1966

BEHIND SENATE DOORS

The Art of Candid Secrecy

By MARY McGRORY
Star Staff Writer

The Senate has formally declared that it talks too much.

People have noticed this about the world's greatest deliberative body, but it is the first time that the Senate has rendered the judgment on itself.

Naturally it is not the kind of thing one wishes to say about oneself in public and the Senate talked it over in a secret session yesterday that lasted three and a half hours.

Theoretically they were discussing the secrets of the secret Central Intelligence Agency, which lately has been saying it's really not all that secret. The management of the Senate decided that whether it was discussing its own character flaws or those of the CIA, the fewer people who knew about it the better.

Nobody knows yet exactly what was said in the closed session. Nobody who participated was allowed to say.

Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, who advanced right out in the open the proposal of Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn., to admit three members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the watchdog group that knows the secrets of the secret agency, acted as a kind of cultural spy for the press.

He came out after the vote and said that the debate was one of the best he had ever attended. "Better attended, better atmosphere and better attention," he said.

Who knows why senators crave attention. They hire press secretaries, they flood the press with releases, they fight for television time. Yet, unobserved, apparently they function more senatorially.

What moved them to decide that there is among them a fatal tendency to spill the beans?

It may have been a line spoken in an open session by Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., who said he noticed a "different application" of the secrecy rule by his colleagues.

Sometimes, he said, he read in the paper full disclosure of a secret session before the

meeting had even broken up. Russell felt that the advocates of the McCarthy proposal were shaking the very foundations of the Senate.

"I realize," said the great captain of the Confederate states, "that we are living in a new day."

That new day, of course, began on Tuesday, when the voters of the Old Dominion voted out of power Rep. Howard W. Smith, the chairman of the House Rules Committee, also had questioned the right of Sen. A. Willis Robertson, D-Va., to stay in his seat.

But the "new day" so deplored by Russell did not reach the Senate chamber. He held back the dawn. He is himself an institution, a man of supreme parliamentary skill and enormous personal prestige.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he oversees, with the help of several like-minded colleagues, the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

He began his argument against the inclusion of Senate Foreign Relations Committee representation on a high constitutional level. The Armed Services Committee, charged with the high duty of supervising National Security Council matters, should be allowed to review the suggestion, he said.

But it was apparent that if his objections were institutional, they were also personal.

Fulbright said he thought the proposal was not really so irrational, since the Foreign Relations Committee is directly concerned with foreign policy, a field in which the CIA has dabbled occasionally.

"Why monopolize it?" he asked.

"I'm not trying to muscle in on any other committee," said Russell heatedly. "I'm just trying to keep people from muscling in on my committee."

And the Senate secretly agreed with him that the Armed Services Committee is Russell's committee and that members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who do not sufficiently understand the need for secrecy, better keep out.